

/xi/

L. IA. Shternberg as an Investigator of the Peoples of
the Far East

IA. P. Al'kor (Koshkin)

* 114

L. IA. Shternberg devoted a significant part of his life to the study of the peoples of the Far East. His scientific work began with the study of the Gilyak on Sakhalin (in 1890); it so prematurely ended with a paper on the "Ainskaia problema /The Ainu Problem/" for the Academy of Sciences of the USSR (in 1927), upon his return from the Third Pacific Congress in Tokyo.

In his youth Shternberg did not think of scientific work. While still on the schoolbench, he dreamed of giving his whole life "for the good of the people." As a student in the Physics-Mathematics Department of St. Petersburg University and later in the Department of Law of the Novorossisk University, Shternberg took part in revolutionary activity, to which he gave his best young years. He was arrested in 1886 for active participation in the "The People's Will" party, and in the spring of 1889, after a three-year "stretch" in the Odessa central prison, he was deported for ten years to Sakhalin Island, where his ethnographic work began. Thus, the Tsarist prison and exile pushed Shternberg quite unexpectedly onto the path of a scientist.

* 114

● 121

127

It is true that even before his arrest and exile, Shternberg was interested in questions of primitive history and sociology, but he received the decisive push in that direction in the Odessa prison, where, due to a happy accident, he became acquainted with F. E Engels' book, The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State, in German. This book, as we shall see later, greatly facilitated the beginning of Shternberg's investigations on the history of family-clan relations and had a highly significant influence on his first works.

* 114

Setting out in exile, Shternberg nourished the hope that even in distant banishment he would in one way or another be able to be useful to the community, but he did not even think about ethnographic work among the local /xii/ "natives" (in the

/xii cont. /

*114 Shternberg commenced a broader and a more systematic study of the Gilyak in the first part of February, 1891, when the administration, having learned of his work with the Gilyak, commissioned him to make a family census of the northwestern Gilyak of Sakhalin from the village of Arkyvo to Cape Marii.

*114
127 /xiii/ During this trip Shternberg discovered group marriage and a classificatory system of kinship among the Gilyak. Parallel to this, he carefully studied the clan rules and religious views of the Gilyak. It might be mentioned here that prior to his scientific research he had not even had the opportunity to become familiar with the basic works of that time on the ethnography of the Far East. This is what he writes in the preface to his "Materialy /Materials/": "Due to the conditions of my stay on Sakhalin, even Schrenck's work on the history and material culture of the Amur peoples remained inaccessible to me for a long time... (1). From a careful

[13]

1. Materialy po izucheniiu giliatskogo yazyka i fol'klora /Materials on the Study of Gilyak Language and Folklore/, Vol. I, p. viii, St. Petersburg, 1908, publication of the Academy of Sciences.

analysis of Shternberg's literary heritage and of his first printed works, it is clear that at the time of his first trip to the Gilyak he had not had the opportunity to acquaint himself with either Schrenck's book, Ob inorodtsakh Amurskogo kraia /Concerning the Natives of the Amur Region/, or even Morgan's Ancient Society (Drevnee obshchestvo). Tylor's Pervobytnaia kul'tura /Primitive Culture/, or the other works on the history of primitive society. On the other hand, his prison acquaintance with Engels' classic work was not wasted on him. There is no doubt but that it was thanks to this study that he was able in such an astonishingly short period to discover among the Gilyak group marriage and a classificatory system of kinship and, basically, to realize clearly the full significance of this discovery. Thus, in a letter of the nineteenth of May to his good friend and companion-in-arms in

*114
● 121
127

[12]

/xiii cont. /

* 114 revolutionary activity, M. A. Krol', Shternberg writes (2):

121
127
[212]

2. I am indebted to the kindness of the widow of the deceased, S. A. Ratner-Shternberg, for acquainting me with the contents of this letter.

"I have discovered among them (the Gilyak) a kinship terminology and family-clan rights identical with those of the Iroquois and the famous punalua family (on the Sandwich Islands), in a word, the remains of that form of marriage on which Morgan based his theory and which served as a point of departure for Marx' and Engels' works on Der Ursprung der Familie, des Staates, u. s. w. /the origin of the family, of the state, etc./. The interesting clan organization of the Gilyak, however, rests on this kinship system. At first I was afraid to trust my own discovery, but, having let not a single family or a single yurt go by during the census without detailed questioning as to what different members of the clan and family call one another and who has what rights, I finally became convinced (3). /xiv/ A1-

[161]

3. Earlier in the same letter Shternberg mentioned that he had covered 1,040 Gilyak in his census.

though there are voluminous studies on the Gilyak, no one in the literature known to me has studied this aspect of the question."

* 114

After his investigation of the Gilyak of the northwest coast, there followed a series of other trips which resulted in a full ethno-

[125]

graphic study of all Sakhalin. Thus, in June, 1891, he took the census of the Gilyak and the Orochi on the river Tym' and on the east coast of Sakhalin, and a partial one of the Tungus. In the winter of 1891 he encountered the Olcha who visited Sakhalin late in the fall for trading purposes. He spent the summer of 1892

[125]

traveling on the river Poronai and around the entire southern part of Sakhalin as far as the settlement of Kosunaya, where, along with the Ainu and the Oroch, he also studied and took a census of the Gilyak.

Tungus RU5
Ainu AB6
Sakhalin
South east Siberia RX1

/1 cont. /

G
101
144

As for the Gilyak, although anthropologically they have been assimilated to a considerable extent with the surrounding nationalities, in many features of their material culture and especially in their social structure they stand equally far apart from the Tungus peoples and from their neighbors, the Ainu. Finally, /2/ in one respect both of the latter groups are distinct from the first one. The Gilyak and the Ainu occupy strictly delimited, almost continuous territories (the Gilyak in north and central Sakhalin and on the banks of the estuary and mouth of the Amur; the Ainu -- on southern Sakhalin and on Lake Esso); furthermore, the dialectical distinctions of each of the languages of these peoples are so insignificant that all the members of a tribe easily understand one another, and therefore among each of these peoples a full awareness of its national unity has been preserved. The peoples of the Tungus group, on the other hand, have separated from one another and are dispersed over the entire, huge region, and certain divisions of them speak dialects considerably different from one another.

T
131
197

Furthermore, they differ considerably among themselves in their way of life as well, so that, in spite of all their linguistic, anthropological, and historical kinship, they fall into separate, small groups, aware of their tribal individuality.

T
121
184

These separate nationalities, separated from one another spacially, historically, linguistically, and, finally, in the realm of material culture, need classification. Such a classification is all the more necessary because certain groups introduced into the ethnography by Schrenck as distinct nationalities actually do not exist.

S
121
121

But on what basis are they to be classified?

S
121
433

Easiest of all would be to construct such a classification on the basis of the economic way of life. If we ignore the southern group -- Manchu, Daur, and Solon, who have little to do with the Russian Priamurye /Amur region/, where they have no significance territorially, then all the remaining nationalities could be divided into two large groups -- some have a reindeer economy, in other words, they are a group of nomad -- reindeer-breeders, such as the Tungus proper, Orochon, Sakhalin Oroch; the other

/130 cont./

58
[591] agnates, the father or her brothers; she makes her permanent residence in his home, follows him in his journeyings and emigrations, and before all the world is considered the personal wife of the Gilyak who purchased her and the mother of his

59
[85] children. The children belong exclusively to the father and succeed him after his death. After the birth of the first child, husband and wife cease to call themselves by their former
[551] names and begin to be called by the name of the newborn
[553] ("the father of so-and-so, the mother of so-and-so" --

[684] teknonymy). The exclusive rights of the husband to his wives apparently are sanctioned by the right of retribution, even bloody retribution, upon the infringer on his conjugal rights.

[614] The clan is based on the principle of agnation, exogamous marriage. One can travel over the whole territory of the Gilyak, live in their yurts, long observe their family life, and note nothing extraordinary. In the large winter yurts, the inhabitants occupy their places by families, each living with regard to its own particular interests. Between husband and wife or wives and their children, harmony and tender /131/ relations prevail. Cases of a striking attachment between spouses are not infrequent; when one of them dies, the other sometimes lays hands on himself or dies of grief.

*601
• 121 In a word, to all appearances we are dealing here with a
125 type of individual family which is generally accepted as being
[59] patriarchal and in any case not polyandrous. Such were my own personal impressions at first. But my first inquiries in the realm of kinship nomenclature awoke serious doubts in me, and I therefore determined first of all to make a detailed study of this aspect of their relations. The study of the kinship nomenclature, it appeared to me, could be most successfully accomplished by a systematic census of the population. With
[114] this objective, I undertook during the winter of 1891 my first census of the Gilyak villages on the western shore of northern Sakhalin, and as a result I discovered their complex classificatory system of kinship and their peculiar form of group marriage (1).

[113]

1. At the time the account of this was

114 /131 cont./
*601
•121
125
[113]

presented by the author to the Moskovskoe obshchestvo liubitele estestvoznaniia /Moscow Society of Friends of Natural Science/ and appeared under the title "Sakhalinskie giliaki /The Sakhalin Gilyak/" in 1893 in the organ of this society, Etnograficheskoe Obozrenie (1893, Book 2). In the foreign press there was a review of this article by Friedrich Engels in Die Neue Zeit, 1892-93, XI Jahrgang, B. I.

Subsequent censuses in other districts of the Gilyak territory (1891-94) gave me a full and comprehensive picture of their kinship nomenclature and sexual relations, with all their variants, in the different clans and dialects. In particular, during these years I succeeded in becoming acquainted with the unique family structure among the Sakhalin Ainu, sharply differentiated by the typical peculiarities of their maternity /materniteta/. In 1895 and 1896 I investigated in the same respect the Tungus tribes of the Priamur krai /the Amur region/, where I discovered a fully developed classificatory system of kinship resembling that of the Gilyak, but differing significantly from the latter. Thus I gathered sufficient material for a comprehensive comparison of both the kinship terminology and the clan-family mode of life of all the representatives of the Priamur krai.

*601
121 In view of the extreme importance of the kinship terminology for an understanding of the whole structure of the family and clan of the Gilyak, and in view of the extensive disputes that have recently arisen in scientific circles over the classificatory system of kinship and its significance, I consider it necessary to survey it in all its details.

II.

Terms and Forms of Kinship

G
*601
197

Before proceeding to the kinship nomenclature of the Gilyak itself, it will not be without interest to dwell on the question: to what degree is this nomenclature independent in the formal sense of the word, what is its relationship to the kinship nomenclature of their neighbors -- the Ainu and Tungus peoples of the Priamur krai, and through the latter to the Ural-Altaic group of peoples in general, for in that ceaseless process of mingling which inevitably took place between the Gilyak and their neighbors, borrowings in this field in particular would be noticeable. We shall give below a special sketch of the nomenclature and norms of marriage among the Ainu, as well as among the Tungus peoples. We shall see that these peoples also have classificatory systems of kinship, although considerably different from that of the Gilyak, and it will be all the more interesting to elucidate to what extent these kinship designations resemble each other.

G
•121
*601
191

G
*601
191
A
601
191

T
[601]
[191]

We shall begin with the Ainu. Taking into account a priori the reckoning of kinship through the mother and other sharp features of maternity, in contrast to the agnatic principle of the Gilyak, one could say that there must be little similarity between the kinship designations of the two peoples. Indeed, the only term which has a complete phonetic resemblance is the term "aki," but in Gilyak, as in the Tungus languages, it signifies elder brother, while in Ainu, on the other hand -- younger; thus the correspondence may be completely accidental. Other Ainu terms which sound more or less like the Gilyak, for example, "acha" -- uncle, "nana" -- mother (Kurile Islands) again do not correspond in meaning: the Gilyak "achk" signifies mother-in-law /wife's mother/, aunt, grandmother; "nanakh" -- elder sister. The remaining terms do not have the faintest similarity to each other. One could assume that there would be a much greater

/149 cont. /

III.

The Classificatory System of Kinship and the Norms of Sexual Intercourse and Marriage

83
● [121] Now we shall see to what degree the aforementioned kinship system corresponds to the contemporary norms of sexual intercourse and marriage.

Among the Gilyak, at least at the present time, we cannot speak of any kind of general prohibitions against extra-marital sexual relations.

Sexual relations with a woman in the eyes of a Gilyak is a completely nonchalant and natural act, like any other natural act, satisfying a certain natural need of man. Prohibitions and restrictions apply only to definite circles bound by agnate or cognate kinship. Outside of these circles there is no regulation or censure of sexual behavior, either on the part of public opinion or on the part of religion. Outside of the prohibited circles, sexual relations out of wedlock have only one restriction: the reaction of the one or the other party concerned. Young men of a given clan, having rights to the women of a certain /150/ locality, may be aggrieved at an alien usurper and soundly teach the stranger not to sneak into a territory not his own, which, by the way, happens very rarely. It is a much more serious affair if a married woman is involved. A stranger caught in flagrante delicto with a married woman is slain at the scene of the crime; such was the custom at least until the most recent times; only the fear of penal repression has begun to restrain some from impulsive slayings, which are beginning to be replaced by duels and ransom. The woman suffers less in such cases. They beat her thoroughly, but the affair never goes so far as killing her: 684
562
[581] in the first place, because, as we shall see further on, a woman is always considered the cognate of her husband, and, in the second place, because she is an article of value, having cost her husband dearly, and furthermore she is a necessary worker. 684 In any case, the matter is not settled without repression, bloody

/156 cont./

835 and of designating the wife of the younger tuvn by the prohibitory term jokh; and, correspondingly, sexual relations between a man and the wife of his younger brother are not permitted. Notwithstanding the dominance of this norm at the present time, originally both the terminology and the norms of intercourse were apparently identical with respect to all the wives of brothers without distinction. Evidence of this is not only the fact that in certain places, as we have seen, this arrangement still prevails, but also certain features of the terminology which have been retained even in those places where the new order is dominant. Thus, for example, children everywhere without distinction call the wives of all the brothers of their father ymk, i. e., by the same term that they apply to their own mother, and (in many places) all the brothers of the father ytk (father), from which we must conclude that formerly the sexual rights of men extended to the wives of all brothers without distinction.

The norms of lawful sexual intercourse. From the kinship nomenclature we know that whole groups of men call whole groups of women their wives, and vice versa, i. e., the latter call them their husbands. This strange nomenclature fully corresponds to actuality; in the language of our own European nomenclature, such groups of men and women are joined in marriage.

121
581 But before entering into a detailed examination of these relationships, strange from a contemporary point of view, it is necessary, in order to avoid misunderstanding, to analyze precisely the meaning of the term "marriage."

In the institution of marriage there are three main features: 1) sexual intercourse, 2) begetting offspring, and 3) common /157/ domestic activity. It is completely clear that the intrinsically indispensable element in marriage is only the first, namely, sexual intercourse; the other two features, although they, too, play an enormous role in the marital union, may be completely absent. There are marriages which, on account of natural or artificial causes, are

/157 cont./

● 121
581 childless. Furthermore, there are marriages which do not pursue domestic aims. By itself alone, however, sexual intercourse between certain individuals of different sex, even though it may be regular, still does not constitute a sign of marriage. In order that sexual intercourse be transformed into a marriage, it is necessary that this be sanctioned in one form or another by a given social environment, that it not provoke a social or religious reaction, in a word, that it be lawful.

121
171
581 The lawfulness of sexual intercourse, then, constitutes the essential sign of marriage. On this point, the concept of marriage is similar among the most diverse peoples in the most diverse stages of development. If there are variations, it is only in the forms in which sexual intercourse is realized in marriage. It is just these variations, often so contradictory to the notions of contemporary society, which most of all obscure the idea of marriage when one chances to encounter the forms of sexual intercourse among primitive peoples.

A true understanding of the institution of marriage among primitive peoples is obscured most of all by our habitual notion that marriage invariably presupposes joint cohabitation of the spouses and, consequently, the manifest and regular realization of conjugal rights.

Among many peoples, however, and not only primitive peoples, but even historical ones, this is not required at all. Among the Spartans, for example, the women lived apart from the men, and meetings between husband and wife took place under compulsory secrecy.

This is the case, even as a general rule, among many contemporary primitive peoples, among whom are found the so-called "unions of men." These latter, including also the married ones, spend all their time in a common house where women are not allowed, and the wives and children live in special little houses. On the Fiji Islands, married couples can spend the night together only in secret. We find similar phenomena even among peoples where male unions are unknown.

581
121
171
/157 cont./

For example, among the Ainu, when women get married, they often remain in their father's house, and the husband, who lives in another settlement, sometimes at a great distance from the settlement of his father-in-law, /158/ visits his wife only at a certain time of the year. Among the Kirgiz, until the final payment of the bride price, the husband, sometimes for years, visits his wife only at night, and then in secret from her parents. We do not find regularity even among polygamists of the Mussulman type. The Turk may have in his harem women with whom he does not have sexual intercourse for years, but they nevertheless are considered wives, joined with him in marriage. The condition of joint cohabitation and regular sexual intercourse is still less possible among peoples where, according to the socially established order, a whole group of men considers a whole group of women their wives, and, conversely, a man exercises his right only as far as possible.

Within the Australian Dieri tribe every "kumi" (a term corresponding to the Gilyak pu -- husband) finds his "kroki" (wife) throughout the whole extent of his territory, in whatever settlement he visits. A kumi may live out his whole life without seeing one or another of his innumerable kroki, but she is nevertheless his wife, for, if he visits her settlement, he can exercise his right without subjecting himself to social censure, punishment of the gods, or a reaction on the part of the individual husband of his kroki, as would a non-kumi who did this (1). The potentiality of lawful sexual intercourse

1. Fison and Howitt, Kamilaroi and Kurnai, 1880, pp. 340 f.

takes various forms among different peoples, but the legal essence of the relations remains the same. In one place, persons bound by such a form of marriage are invested not only with rights, but also with obligations, in other words,

581
121
171
/158 cont. /

one or another party has no right to refuse sexual relations with a person who is entitled to them. For example, among the Chukchee a woman may not refuse a man joined with her husband in the relationship of a "variable marriage."

Among others, full scope is given to individual sympathies, as, for example, among the aforementioned kumi and kroki, among the Tungus peoples, among the Gilyak, where the agreement of both parties is demanded for sexual intercourse, but once this agreement obtains, intercourse becomes lawful. In essence, what we have here is the same phenomenon as in pure polygamy. A husband may prefer one wife to another, even completely avoid a certain wife, but the marriage is present nevertheless. It is the same also in group marriage: in spite of the separation of the living places of the group spouses and the clear potentiality of conjugal rights, lawfulness of sexual intercourse within the group, and consequently also marriage, is present.

/159/ Of course, joint cohabitation and regular sexual intercourse are the most normal for marriage. We observe the tendency towards this, although in varying degrees, among the most diverse peoples. This tendency, however, must not be confused with the tendency toward individual possession. The instinct for sexual selection and individual sympathies indeed pushes even primitive man toward establishing more or less durable conjugal bonds. But pairing up presupposes neither obligatory individual possession nor, what is more, obligatory joint cohabitation. We have already offered the example of the Ainu, whose wife often remains living in her parents' home, sometimes several days' journey from her husband. Among the Ainu, however, marriage is purely individual. All the more natural is the absence of the aforementioned conditions among those peoples where group forms of marriage exist, for persons to whom the right of sexual relations is extended are many, and for this very reason joint cohabitation and, consequently, the regular exercise of the right of sexual intercourse between all the persons involved in the group marriage rarely take place.

/159 cont./

581
121
191
In reality, joint cohabitation and regular intercourse are connected, not with the sexual feature of the marital union, but with the economic aspect. Wherever economic conditions demand the joint collaboration of a whole group of persons and allow living together, group marriage there can turn into a regular, communal marriage. But such conditions are rarely found in primitive society. They are possible -- but even then not often -- in a narrow circle of brothers; in this case group marriage is really accompanied by the elements of joint cohabitation and the regular exercise of marital rights familiar to us. We meet examples of such a clan among the Gilyak, among several Tungus tribes, in Tibet, in India, and in other places. But types of this kind of cohabitation are also rare.

433
121
191
In spite of the old opinion, which was accustomed to depicting the life of primitive people in communistic colors, in reality the economy of primitive man, at least the methods of obtaining the means of subsistence, is at the present time mainly individual, and the forms of general collaboration that crop up only at certain times disappear as quickly as they arose with the passing of the necessity for them. We may see a typical specimen of individual economy among the wandering Tungus reindeer-breeders, who /180/ assemble once or twice a year for only a short time and then in small related groups. In normal times they live apart, widely separated from one another, each one selecting for himself his own territory for pasture and hunting.

581
121
433
Among peoples who are not herdsmen, who live closer together, the forms of economy are all more or less individual. Under such circumstances it is quite natural that every man, conducting his own particular economy, should strive to have with him a woman who, in conformity with the natural division of labor between the sexes, might perform with him his economic duties. Thus, joint and regular cohabitation between a man and one or several women arises by itself. In societies where group norms of sexual intercourse exist, such individual alliances change nothing. An

/160 cont./

- 581 individual wife always lives in one house with her husband,
● 121 works with him, raises children with him, and is obliged to follow him wherever he wishes, but at the same time she has the right to share her caresses with impunity also with a whole group of individuals to whom this is allowed by established rights.- Life has sanctioned such individual alliances, the more so as economic interests here coincide with the other mighty motive of sexual selection, the individual inclination of representatives of the different sexes. For this very reason, along with irregular marital relations, individual unions appear, also sanctioned by society. An arrangement appears whereby a separate member of society may at the same time be joined in an individual marriage and in a group marriage. Persons who are joined in an individual marriage are bound not only by regular sexual intercourse and cohabitation, but also by a common economy and common offspring. At the same time, however, to each of them is given the lawful opportunity to have sexual intercourse with persons of their own marital group. And although such sexual intercourse takes place irregularly, often demands conditions of secrecy, and usually presupposes the consent of both parties to each act of intercourse, nevertheless it is just because this is socially recognized, lawful, that it does not provoke any reaction, either social or religious, and because it manifests itself legally -- for marriage is a term of law -- we ought to define such relations as marital relations. This is not only theoretically true; it coincides also with the juridical views of those peoples among whom these institutions exist. /161/ First of all, [601] the very kinship nomenclature itself, according to which individual and group spouses are not distinguished by appellation, is evidence of this. Further, these relations usually impose on the participants in a group marriage the same obligations as are imposed on individual husbands. Thus, for [587] example, when an individual husband dies, one of the members of the group marriage must replace the husband of the widow, even though she may no longer be capable of sexual

581 /161 cont./
587
121

intercourse; he must support her and her children, who usually are also considered the children of all the members of the group.

835

Now the Gilyak marriage classes "pu" and "an'g:ej" become understandable to us, and we shall proceed to a detailed examination of them.

The classes "pu" and "an'g:ej." We have already said that for the Gilyak, at least at the present time, it is not prohibited either by religion or by the opinion of society to have sexual relations with or to marry any woman of his own tribe or a neighboring one, except for those women who are bound to him by one or another prohibitive term of kinship. But in relation to such alien women he has no rights whatever; illicit sexual intercourse is accompanied by the risk of bloody reaction on the part of a certain group of males, and individual marriage is a simple civil agreement accompanied by strict conditions of payment for the bride. The Gilyak most naturally therefore seeks sexual intercourse or a legal wife among the women with whom he has the right to do so.

[601] These are, namely, those women whom by the kinship nomenclature, either from birth or from another specifically defined moment, he calls an'g:ej (wife), and he calls all [602] their agnates akhmalk'i (fathers-in-law). We already know who these women are. They are, first of all: 1) the daughters of all the "brothers" of the mother; 2) all the "sisters" of the wife; 3) "sisters" of the wives of brothers; 4) "sisters" of the father-in-law of the son; 5) individual wives of all aki, i. e., of brothers who are older than the person speaking (among the majority of Gilyak); 6) individual wives of all "brothers" of the person speaking, without distinctions of age (in certain places).

[601] Each woman, in turn, as we know, gives the name of husband, in addition to her own official husband, to: 1) all the sons of the sisters of her father; 2) all the husbands of her "sisters" and the "brothers" of these husbands; 3) all the younger "brothers" of her husband (if she is married to one of them), and among some -- all the brothers of her husband.

/213 cont. /

* 614
615
602
clan, in view of the reciprocity of the clans standing in the
tujma akhmalk relationship, no marriage relationships are
possible between them. As we have seen above, the
obstacle is not the closeness /214/ of kinship, but, on the
contrary, the distant degree of kinship in comparison with
the relationship to the other clans of the phratry.

VIII.

Cousin Marriage.

582
* 174
● 121
We have seen that the basic form of marriage among
the Gilyak is marriage between the son of a sister and the
daughter of her brother. Thus, the type of the Gilyak mar-
riage is a variety of the so-called cousin marriage.

How did this variety come about? This leads us necessarily
to the general problem of kuzennogo braka (cousin marriage
/given in Eng. /) as an important stage in the evolution of
marriage. I shall allow myself to dwell briefly on this prob-
lem.

582
* 174
121
114
As long ago as 1900, in my report to the Russian
Geographical Society and in subsequent articles -- "Teoriia
rodovogo byta /Theory of Clan Life/" and "Endogamiia i
ekzogamiia /Endogamy and Exogamy/" -- starting from an
analysis of the Gilyak form of marriage, I showed that
cousin marriage is the primary form of exogamy and that it
gave rise to the classificatory system of marriage, group
marriage, and the institution of the clan. At that time I
showed that the exogamous institution of the clan was not only
an institution of prohibitions, but an institution whose main
function was to provide a given kinship union with a constant
reservoir of wives from a group of persons bound by a com-
munity of blood, which plays such an important role in the
various stages of the community.

/214 cont. /

582
*174 Works of recent times, in particular those of Rivers,
121 Crawley, and Frazer, in connection with the work of their
114 predecessors in the field of Australian and Dravidian marriage,
171 such as Fison and Howitt, Spencer and Gillen, Kohler, and others, revealed not only the picture of the broad distribution of this form of marriage at the present time (1).

[113]

1. This picture entitled Crawley to say that "cousin marriage generally is the favorite form of marriage among primitive peoples" ("Exogamy and the Mating of Cousins," Anthropological Essays, Oxford, 1907, p. 57).

582
*174 but on the basis of examples of Australian marriage they
114 proved without a doubt that cousin marriage was the first
121 experience of conscious restriction of marriages between brother and sister, and that all further evolution of marriage represented a series of gradual limitations on marriages between cousins of the first degree. One cardinal question in this problem still, one might say, remains open. This is the question of why /215/ cousin marriage demands marriage between the children of brother and sister, but at the same time prohibits marriage between the children of two brothers or between the children of two sisters. Only Rivers directly refuses to find an explanation for this striking fact. "Cousin marriage," he says, "is, according to all appearances, a survival. It is quite difficult to find a straightforward psychological basis explaining why marriage between the children of a brother and a sister is desired, while marriage between the children of two brothers or two sisters is so strictly prohibited" (1).

[113]

1. "Marriage /of/ Cousins in India," The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, July, 1907, p. 623.

/215 cont. /

582 Others have attempted to give an explanation for this
* 174 fact, but these explanations are purely mechanical. Kohler,
114 for example, sees an explanation of this fact in the dual
● 121 organization of society (2) -- an explanation which is at

2. Zur Urgeschichte der Ehe, 121.

least strange, for the dual organization itself is a consequence of the institution of cousin marriage. Crawley holds the same point of view as Kohler and therefore falls into the same error. He considers this form of cousin marriage to be "an automatic result of the fact that the name of the family is inherited. The children of brother and sister may marry because by their names they belong to opposite phratries" (3).

3. Crawley, op. cit., 57.

Frazer expresses himself in the same way. According to him, the reason that it is forbidden for these cousins of the first degree, i.e., children of two brothers or two sisters, to marry rests on the fact that they belong to one and the same exogamous class and are therefore restrained by the basic law which forbids a man to marry a woman from his own exogamous class.

The basic mistake of all these writers consists in their having taken the result for the cause, namely, that the so-called cross-cousin marriage, i.e., marriage between the children of brother and sister, was a result of the division of society into two exogamous classes, but they do not raise the question of just what it was that gave rise, in turn, to this dual division. In reality, the dual division into two exogamous classes was a result of the new institution of marriage between children of brother and sister, replacing the earlier endogamous blood marriage.

582 Before that, the group -- the descendants of one an-
* 174 cestress -- was /216/ indivisible; marriages took place
121 within the group, usually between brother and sister. And

/216 cont. /

582
* 174
● 121

it was only when these marriages were recognized to be harmful and marriage between the children of brother and sister was established that the original, single society was divided into two exogamous halves: in one of these halves were the brothers with their wives and their descendants, and in the other were the sisters with their husbands and their descendants. Consequently, the dual division was a result of cross-cousin marriage, and one must therefore not seek the cause of the aforementioned regulation of this form of marriage in the dual division, but in something else. This cause must be sought in that situation under which the change from blood marriages to exogamous marriage in the form of cousin marriage took place. The study of the Australian classes first of all confirms the long disputed opinion of Morgan that exogamy is the result of realizing the harm of blood marriages, marriages between brothers and sisters. It shows also that the transfer to the exogamous forms took place with extreme gradualness and slowness, a fact that is easily explained by the usual conservatism of primitive man in general, and in particular with respect to such an institution as marriage, which is so closely bound up with religious ideas. This very psychology of conservatism, which at every change of the old institution tries to preserve at least the old form, in which it clothes the new institution, has resulted in the apparently paradoxical fact that the institution which, in the consciousness of the harmful effects of blood marriage, established marriages between cousins of the first degree allowed such marriages exclusively between the children of brothers and sisters and at the same time forbade such marriages between the children of two brothers and two sisters, although the latter are hardly distinguished in any way from the former in the blood sense.

582
* 174
● 121
/216 cont./

How did this come about? The fact is that the cross-cousin marriage undoubtedly appeared to replace that stage where the preferred orthodox form of marriage was marriage between brother and sister. Under this form of marriage, not only were the spouses brothers and sisters, but also their parents. Thus, the formula of this marriage was expressed in the fact that marriages were effected between the children of brother and sister, and these latter were spouses in their turn.

This is why, when necessity forced the abandonment of this form of marriage and the replacing of it by cousin marriage, the conservative mind of primitive man chose that form which bore the closest outward resemblance to the old form sanctified by time /217/ and religion, namely, that one in which the only orthodox marriages were marriages between the children of brother and sister (although now these latter were no longer spouses), and not between the children of two brothers or two sisters. Thus the form, which always plays a paramount role in the eyes of the primitive man, was saved. In saving the form, primitive man naïvely imagined that the existence of a new change was thus concealed from the deity -- the usual manner of pious "deceit" of the gods.

In just this way brothers -- own and collateral -- and their descendants, on the one hand, and sisters and their descendants, on the other hand, formed the two exogamous halves of the former single society.

Another very important, although less cardinal question to which the investigators of cousin marriage give no answer is the following. If cousin marriage is explained as the first stage of exogamy, as the first measure thereof, then from where does its obligatory, its almost necessary character come? It would seem, on the contrary, that once the good of exogamy was recognized it would be most logical to encourage marriage between the least closely related persons, even between individuals who were entirely alien to each

7217 cont. /

582
* 174
● 121
other, while marriages between cousins should have been allowed for the first time only as a necessary evil, malum necessarium, in order that it might pass completely out of use as an antisocial institution.

582
171
* 174
121
The evolution of marriage among the Australian peoples can serve as the best example of this strange fact. Among these peoples, judging from the organization of classes and from their personal declarations, the consciousness of the harm of marriage within close degrees of kinship is quite well developed, and they have manifested great resourcefulness in order to block the possibility of close marriages, excelling other peoples in this respect. Such a complicated system as the eight-class system of the Arunta tribe has been specially devised for the abolishment of marriages between cousins of the first degree. It would seem after this that marriages between the most remote degrees of relationship ought to be encouraged, while marriages between cousins of the second degree ought to be regarded as merely allowable. Among them, however, even "cousins of the third degree are thought too remote, and marriages beyond this degree are prohibited" (1). Thus, marriage with cousins even of

1. Crawley, op. cit., 61.

an impossibly close degree is not only allowed, but obligatory.

Further, if cousin marriage is only the first stage of exogamy, /218/ then why, in spite of the enormous period of time which has passed since its inception, does it continue to survive so stubbornly up to the present time among a large number of tribes, including such numerous ones as the Dravidians, in its original, unaltered form. And even there, as among the tribes of Australia, it underwent limitation in the sense of the exclusion of marriages between cousins of the first degree, but still the principle, as we just saw, is preserved inviolate, and marriages beyond cousins of the third degree are not permitted. This stubborn invoking of

582
124
121
171
/218 cont./

the principle, this persistent striving to perpetuate it by means of obligation, must rest on a serious basis. It seems to us that the strength of the cousin marriage rests on two important motives. The first motive is the natural striving of every kinship group, in particular of each mother, to provide her progeny with wives.

At the primitive stage of human development the element of struggle in sexual relations undoubtedly played just as tremendous a role as in the zoological kingdom in general. And one of the most important problems of human communities was to limit this struggle as far as possible, by one or another regulation.

The institution of marriage, obligatory between persons of a certain group, was that form of sexual regulation which was called upon to satisfy the above-mentioned fundamental dictate of the community. Prior to the establishment of exogamy, this dictate could be satisfied by the intrablood marriages obligatory between brothers and sisters. With the establishment of the principle of exogamy, cross-cousin marriage most satisfactorily solved this problem. From birth, the sons of a woman are the husbands of the daughters of her brother, and the sons of this latter are the husbands of her daughter. This combination satisfies to an equal degree the father of the family as well, because his children marry the children of his sister.

The other motive of cousin marriage is religious: with such marriages people not alien by blood, but rather of a common origin through the father and mother, come together at the domestic hearth, with its gods-ancestors. And both spouses may to an equal extent count on the favor of the common gods-ancestors. This is a feature of primary importance in the eyes of primitive man, for whom the blessing of the gods and the observance of religious rituals is an extremely important matter in life, one of the major means in the struggle for existence. That is why this form of marriage became not /219/ only favored, but religiously obligatory.

/219 cont./

582 That is why up to the present time among a large number of
* 124 Dravidian tribes marriage is mandatory when a brother has a
121 daughter and his sister a son. That is why, as we saw among
● 121 the Australian tribes, with all the striving toward limiting
cousin marriage, marriages more remote than cousins of
the third degree are prohibited; consequently, marriages
between cousins of the second degree are obligatory. That
is why among the Mongols, whose favored marriages are
the marriages between persons alien to each other, marriages
between the children of a brother and sister are called "white
sin," i. e., considered acceptable, while marriages even
between the most remote members of one clan are "black
sin," i. e., completely unallowable. In order not to increase
the examples, we shall end with the Gilyak, among whom,
in spite of all the peripetela of this small tribe, only the
marriage between the son of a sister and the daughter of her
brother is considered "pure marriage."

582
* 124
121
After these preliminary observations, we may proceed
to an examination of the question as to what place the
Gilyak norm of marriage occupies in the history of the evolu-
tion of marriage in general.

Cousin marriage, as we saw, owes its origin to the
realization of the harm of marriage between close blood
kinsmen. We saw as well that, in accordance with a whole
series of motives -- conservatism, religious ideas connected
with the cult of ancestors, and, finally, the striving for the
peaceful organization of marriage -- primitive man did not
proceed immediately from blood marriage between brother
and sister to remote degrees of kinship or to marriage between
persons alien by blood. In the great revolution in blood-
kinship marriage the most scrupulous gradualness was observed.
Thus, as we saw, even now among the Australian peoples
the first form of exogamy took the form of obligatory marriage
between the children of brother and sister. Since these
marriages proceed consistently from generation to generation,
society, with such an arrangement, is divided into two halves,
which mutually, by generations, give each other their women.

/219 cont. /

* 582
124
● 121 When adapted to individual families, this arrangement is expressed in the fact that the son of a brother marries the daughter of his sister, and, conversely, the son of a sister marries the daughter of her brother. The spouses are cousins of the first degree, while the wife of each man is, on the one hand, the daughter of the sister of his father, and, on the other hand, the daughter of the brother of his mother, because the fathers of the spouses married each other's sister.

Such was the first stage of the limitation on marriages between persons close by blood. Further limitation occurred (191) /220/ differently in different places. In Australia this limitation proceeded very early on the broadest course: from marriages between cousins of the first degree, they proceeded to marriages between cousins of the second degree, and the previous marriages between cousins of the first degree were prohibited.

Nothing in the social structure changed with this arrangement. Society remained divided as before into two halves which exchanged women, with the difference that a man married, not the daughter of the sister of his father, but the daughter of his cousin of the first degree, so that the progeny of a brother and sister could once again be joined in marriage only in the second generation. Spouses became further removed from one another by one generation, both on the side of the father and on the side of the mother. The principle of the exchange of women, which constituted the essence of cross-cousin marriage, was preserved inviolate, while the principle that marriage was obligatory between the children of a brother and sister was basically violated. It turned out to be impossible to preserve both principles in complete purity.

On analogous premises, the evolution proceeded differently among those peoples for whom marriage was built on the Gilyak principle. In the name of conservatism they considered it more important to preserve the second principle, sacrificing the first.

/220 cont./

582
* 174
● 121 The peoples of this group, for which the Gilyak serve as the most striking representative, began to limit marriages between cousins of the first degree, considering it necessary to establish a more remote degree of kinship between spouses, but they did not wish to sacrifice that principle which seemed to them most important, namely, the one according to which each mother receives for her son the daughter of her brother. They actually preserved this principle, but, in order to satisfy the necessity of lessening the closeness of kinship between spouses, they sacrificed the other principle of cross-cousin marriage.

As we know, the son of a woman receives the daughter of her brother, but the reverse, i.e., the marriage of the son of a brother and the daughter of his sister, is not allowed. As a result the limitation on the closeness of kinship obtains -- spouses are cousins of the first degree only on one side -- the side of the mother of the husband, but not on the side of the mother of the wife, while previously, with cross-cousin marriage, they were cousins of the first degree both on the side of the mothers and on the side of the fathers of both spouses. But at the same time there is preserved here the old basic principle -- marriage to the daughter of the brother of the mother, and the spouses remained cousins of the first degree -- true, on one side only.

/221/ This departure from the peoples of the Australian type in the form of the limitation on marriage between cousins of the first degree brought about a fundamental change in the organization of society. It brought about the transition from a bipartite division of society with its classes to the organization of a pure clan, and in particular to the four-clan phratry that we saw among the Gilyak.

[171] With the Australian system of limitations on marriages within close degrees of kinship, no matter how far these limitations went (at the present time they do not go further than cousins of the second degree), society remains irrevocably divided from the standpoint of marriage into two exogamous

/221 cont. /

582 groups, joined in the constant mutual exchange of women.
* 174 In fact, each division is a real clan, because marriages are
● 121 prohibited within the division. True, along with these two
171 divisions a complex system of marriage classes is established,
but these latter change nothing, for no matter what class a
man belongs to, he continues to remain in his division, while
the classes do not change the position of the person in the
clan, but are only mnemonic titles personally limiting a
man (but not his offspring) in the choice of women of a
particular degree of relationship: in the four-class system --
only cousins of the first degree; in the eight-class system,
cousins of the second degree. In reality, classes are not
even obligatory appurtenances for the Australian dual division.
Among the Dieri tribe, for example, there exists the same
prohibition with respect to marriages between cousins of the
first degree as among the Arunta, but, while among the
latter eight classes have been established as a mnemonic
device, among the former this limitation has not been re-
flected in an extensive class division.

Thus it is clear that in the Australian system, by virtue
of its having preserved the principle of the exchange of women,
cross-cousin marriage demands only a division into two clans.
The society is a two-clan phratry.

582 The Gilyak system was unable to remain in this two-
* 174 clan phratry. From the moment when cross-cousin mar-
121 riages, i.e., exchange marriages between the children of
brother and sister, were prohibited, the two-clan phratry was
insufficient: one clan took women from a second clan,
but the latter was obliged to seek women for itself elsewhere,
while, on the other hand, marriages outside of a given
ethnic group were not allowed (as we see now in Australia).
It remained to transform the two-clan phratry into a multiclan
phratry.

/228 cont. /

114 the wife of a son of my mother's brother, is my "sister"
171 (typical cross-marriage). A corresponding series of terms
* 174 is met if "I" am a woman.
601

* 835 All this is without question evidence that the Turanian system was a system of cross-cousin marriage, although the examples introduced by us above (the Batak and the tribes of central India) are evidence that even in the homeland of this system cross-cousin marriage has already begun to change to the unilateral cousin marriage of the Gilyak type.

● 121 It now remains to explain from this point of view a contradictory (according to Morgan's opinion) fact in the
* 174 Ganowanian system, namely, that, in contradistinction to
601 the Tamil system, if "I" am a man, then all the children of
* 835 my male cousins, that is, the children of my father's sister's
615 son and the children of my mother's brother's son, are my
[171] "sons and daughters." We find the analogue of this in the
[114] Gilyak system. Let us recall the four-clan phratry and the case where clan V was short of women, and male cousins of the first clans A and V were obliged to take wives from the corresponding generation of clan S; under the norms of group marriage the children of these cousins are each other's "brothers" and "sisters" and, consequently, are children for both male cousins. The first step in this direction was the formation of that four-clan phratry which we have seen among the Gilyak. This happened quite simply, and we shall see that these four clans in an embryonic state exist also in the Australian system.

121 Let us imagine a society divided, like the Australian
* 174 one, into two phratries, exchanging women in each generation, so that the children of a sister marry the children of
* 835 her brother, and thus the wife of each man is the sister of
615 the husband of his sister.

/229/

*174 Let us further suppose for simplicity's sake that each
 *835 phratry consists of one generation -- groups of brothers and
 •121 sisters, own and collateral, of different degrees of kinship.

615 We shall designate groups of male cousins of one division with capital letters, $A^1 + A^2 + A^3 + A^4 \dots$, and their sisters with the corresponding small letters $a^1 + a^2 + a^3 + a^4$. In the other phratry the corresponding designation for the brothers will be $V^1 + V^2 + V^3 + V^4 \dots$, and for their sisters $v^1 + v^2 + v^3 + v^4$, where identical letters with identical indices designate a group of own brothers and sisters, while different indices designate the degree of cousin kinship among different groups (adjacent groups will be cousins of the first degree, while the degree of kinship between other groups will be expressed by variations in their indices). Like indices of groups having different letters show that persons of these groups are cousins of the first degree both on their father's side and on their mother's side; A^1 , and a^1 are cousins of the first degree to V^1 , v^1 ; A^2 , a^2 are also cousins of the first degree to V^2 , v^2 , etc. But in groups having different letters and different indices, the difference in the indices plus one will show the corresponding degree of cousin kinship: A^1 , a^1 are cousins of the second degree to V^2 , v^2 ; A^2 , a^2 are cousins of the second degree to V^3 , v^3 , etc.

Since groups with different letters and identical indices are cousins of the first degree, and these groups are mutually obliged to marry each other, A^1 marries v^1 (the sister of V^1), while the latter marries a^1 , the sister of A^1 ; likewise A^2 marries v^2 , V^2 marries a^2 , etc.

A general picture of marriage can thus be presented in the form of the following table:

Division I ($A^1 + v^1$) + ($A^2 + v^2$) + ($A^3 + v^3$) + ($A^4 + v^4$) etc.

Division II ($V^1 + a^1$) + ($V^2 + a^2$) + ($V^3 + a^3$) + ($V^4 + a^4$) etc.

220 cont./

The general composition of the phratry may be represented in the following table (see p. 230 /of the original text/).

/230/

I	II
Group of male cousins	Groups of male cousins
$A^1 + A^2 + A^3 + A^4 + A^5 + A^6 \dots$	$V^1 + V^2 + V^3 + V^4 + V^5 + V^6 \dots$
Their sisters:	
$a^1 + a^2 + a^3 + a^4 + a^5 + a^6 \dots$	$v^1 + v^2 + v^3 + v^4 + v^5 + v^6 \dots$

Since the groups $A^1 + A^2 + A^3 + A^4$ etc. and their sisters are related to one another in the same way as the members of the second group V^1, V^2, V^3, V^4 and their sisters, according to the norms of cross-cousin marriage, A^1 is married to v^1 (a sister of V^1), A^2 is married to v^2 , A^3 to v^3 , A^4 to v^4 , etc., and, conversely, V^1 is married to a^1 , V^2 to a^2 , V^3 to a^3 , V^4 to a^4 , etc., in each generation.

Now let us imagine the moment when society first became aware of the harm of cross marriage between cousins of the first degree. From the details of Australian marriage, we know that the first step in this direction was the prohibition of cross marriage between cousins of the first degree and the establishing of cross marriage between cousins of the second degree. As a consequence of this, A^1 no longer marries v^1 , but rather his cousin of the second degree, v^2 , just as V^1 must now marry a^2 , etc.

Marriages under this new arrangement present the following appearance: Division I ($A^1 + v^2$) + ($A^2 + v^1$) + ($A^3 + v^4$) + ($V^4 + a^3$) + ($V^5 + a^6$) + ($V^6 + a^5$) etc. /sic; see errata for original p. 230, line 18, on p. 739 of the foreign text/. Division II ($V^1 + a^2$) + ($V^2 + a^1$) + ($V^3 + a^4$) + ($V^4 + a^3$) + ($V^5 + a^6$) + ($V^6 + a^5$) etc.

It is easy to see that under this arrangement each half of the society is in turn separated into two halves, into two matrimonially isolated groups, namely, the odd members of each division make up only one group, while the even members make up another, and in both divisions together four groups are formed.

/230 cont./

- 121 This four-group division is expressed in the following form:
* 174 Group I ($A^1 + v^2$) + ($A^3 + v^4$) + ($A^5 + v^6$) and other odd
615 members.
* 835 Group II ($A^2 + v^1$) + ($A^4 + v^3$) + ($A^6 + v^5$) and other even members.
Group III ($V^1 + a^2$) + ($V^3 + a^4$) + ($V^5 + a^6$) and other odd members.
Group IV ($V^2 + a^1$) + ($V^4 + a^3$) + ($V^6 + a^5$) and other even members.

- 121 The first group is nebrakopravomochna (inmarriageable
171 /given in English/) with IV, because in some cases, if the
* 174 families become joined in wedlock in /231/ consecutive
615 order, for example ($A^1 + v^2$) with ($V^2 + a^1$), then the chil-
* 835 dren of these families will be bilateral cousins, for their
fathers are mutually married to each other's sisters; in other
cases, for example in families ($A^1 + v^2$) and ($V^4 + a^3$), the
children will be not cousins of the second degree, but cousins
of the third or fourth degree, which is avoided by the
Australian system.. For the same reason groups II and III are
unmarriageable, while groups I and III and groups II and IV
are entirely marriageable in the consecutive order of the
families. Thus, for example, in the families ($A^1 + v^2$) from
group I and ($V^1 + a^2$) from III, as is seen from the indices,
the father of the first family is a cousin of the first degree of
the mother of the second family, and, conversely, the father
of the second family is a cousin of the first degree of the
mother of the first family; consequently, their children are
second degree cousins on the side of both their fathers and
their mothers, which is just what is necessary in Australian
marriage.

But these groups in the Australian system could not develop into the present clan units, because each pair of marriageable groups remained marriageable for only one generation; consequently, the following generation, as the offspring of brother and sister, could not marry, being

/231 cont. /

● 121 cross cousins of the first degree, and for this reason these
615 groups could not become fixed into hereditary unions and
* 835 therefore formed only class generations, the whole practical
* 174 significance of which was in the mnemonic fixation of the
[171] marriage norms.

The role of the four-group division developed quite differently with the Gilyak type of marriage. Here, too, the initial motive was the realization of the harm of marriages between cousins of the first degree, but while in the Australian system the question was resolved by means of a transition to marriages between cousins of the second degree and the absolute prohibition on marriages between cousins of the first degree, with the preservation, however, of the exchange marriage, in the Gilyak marriage the change of norms was limited merely to a prohibition on marriages between bilateral cousins of the first degree, i. e., marriages where the spouses are cousins of the first degree both on the side of the father and on the side of the mother. Here marriage remained obligatory between cousins of the first degree, but only if they were unilateral, i. e., either on the side of the father or on the side of the mother; through this, mutual marriages between two families became absolutely forbidden: under no condition could two men marry each others' sisters; consequently, marriage even between bilateral cousins of the second degree became impossible.

Now let us see how this regulation led to the Gilyak type of phratry.

121 /232/ Let us recall again the phratry with two divisions,
* 174 with marriage between cousins of the first degree. In order
* 835 to facilitate orientation, we repeat the previously introduced
615 diagram of the composition of each generation of spouses according to degrees of kinship, with cross marriage between cousins of the first degree.

/232 cont./

● 121
* 174
* 835
615

Division I: men $A^1 + A^2 + A^3 + A^4 \dots$
their sisters $a^1 + a^2 + a^3 + a^4 \dots$

Division II: men $V^1 + V^2 + V^3 + V^4 \dots$
their sisters $v^1 + v^2 + v^3 + v^4 \dots$

The same letters with identical indices designate a group of own brothers and sisters, while different indices designate the degree of cousin relationship. Persons of different letter-groups with identical indices, for example, A^1 , a^1 and V^1 , and v^1 , or A^2 , a^2 and V^2 , v^2 , are bilateral cousins of the first degree, and they usually join in cross-marriage, i.e., A^1 marries v^1 and V^1 marries a^1 . Persons of different letter-groups with different indices are cousins of more remote degrees according to the larger index.

And now let us imagine the moment when the transition from bilateral cousin marriage to unilateral marriage began, and when the exchange of sisters, that is, cross-cousin marriage, became prohibited.

This transition could not be completed all at once. Among individuals of both divisions there were no unilateral cousins at all, because these were all products of cross-cousin marriage. But since marriages between cousins of the first degree became absolutely prohibited, it would doubtless have become necessary for the first time to arrange marriages between cousins of the next closest degrees. The most rational must be, as we have seen among the Australians, marriage between cousins of the second degree, but, in contrast to the Australian regime, where this form could be strictly put into practice in both divisions (1), here, as a

1. See the above table on p. 338.

consequence of the prohibition of the exchange of women, this form could be employed only in one division of society.

/232 cont./

● 121 In fact, if A^1 married his cousin of the second degree,
 * 174 v^2 , then the brother of the latter, v^2 , could not marry either
 65 a^1 or a^2 , because in such a case two men would be married
 * 835 to each others' sisters. Therefore, v^2 was obliged to take
 a cousin of the third degree, a^3 . The other cases are handled
 in exactly the same way.

/233/ Converting this rule into our schematic rows, we
 obtain the following table of marriage:

Division I: $(A^1 + v^2) + (A^2 + v^1) + (A^3 + v^4) + (A^4 + v^3) +$
 $(A^5 + v^6) + A^6 + v^5) + (A^7 + v^8) + (A^8 + v^7).$

Division II: $(V^1 + a^3) + (V^2 + a^4) + V^3 + a^1) + (V^4 + a^2) +$
 $(V^5 + a^7) + (V^8 + a^6)$ /see errata for original
 page 233, lines 5-6, on page 739 of the foreign
 text/.

In the following generation it already appears possible to
 fulfill the new principle of unilateral cousin marriage with-
 out an exchange of women, where each mother may marry
 her son to the daughter of her brother.

Analyzing the table we see that among the odd members
 of the first division, women have the same indices, respec-
 tively, as men have among the even members of the second
 division, i. e., in these two groups and in each pair of fami-
 lies of the same order, for example, $(A^1 + v^2)$ and $(V^2 + a^4)$,
 the woman of the first family is a sister to the man of the
 second, but the woman of the second family is not his sister,
 but his first cousin, the men of the first family are descendants
 of these families, and consequently they are unilateral
 cousins of the first degree. Thus, consistent with the Gilyak
 principle, according to which the son of the sister receives the
 daughter of her brother, the sons of the first family marry
 the children of the second. The reverse is not allowed.

/233 cont./

● 121
* 174
615
* 835 On the other hand, by comparing the odd members of the first division with the odd members of the second division, we see that the men of the odd families of the first row and the women of the even families of the second row, for instance, the members ($A^1 + v^2$) and ($V^2 + a^4$), have identical indices, i. e., they are brothers and sisters, and consequently the sons of the second row marry the daughters of the first row. One can easily see that the same relationship will obtain between the even members of the first division and the other two rows of the second division.

[171]

Thus, as in Australian marriage, the society, matrimonially, is naturally broken up into four groups:

Division I: Group I: ($A^1 + v^2$) + ($A^3 + v^4$) + ($A^5 + v^6$) + ($A^7 + v^8$) and other odd members.

Group II: ($A^2 + v^1$) + ($A^4 + v^3$) + ($A^6 + v^5$) + ($A^8 + v^7$) and other odd members.

Division II: Group III: ($V^1 + a^3$) + ($V^3 + a^1$) + ($V^5 + a^7$) + ($V^7 + a^5$) and other even members.

Group IV: ($V^2 + a^4$) + ($V^4 + a^2$) + ($V^6 + a^5$) + ($V^8 + a^6$) and other even members.

The families of the first group take for their sons wives /234/ from the corresponding families of group IV, where the mothers of the first are the sisters of the fathers of the second, but the daughters of the first group enter the third group -- into families where their fathers' own sisters are. In exactly the same way the second group takes women from group IV and gives its women to group III. In a word, we have literally everything that we saw in the Gilyak marriage. Since exchange marriage between the two groups does not exist, and consequently in each following generation the descendants of the espoused clans will be unilateral cousins, marriages will without exception take place between the same groups and in the same order of families, so that, in contrast to the Australian groups, in this case these exogamous groups are converted into real clans. Thus we obtain the Gilyak four-clan phratry. In this phratry each clan is joined

/234 cont./

- 121 in marital relations with two other clans, but the fourth is
*174 absolutely forbidden to it, for it and this fourth one are a
615 subgroup of its own primitive exogamous division (groups I
*835 and II are prohibited to each other, and III and IV are like-
wise prohibited to each other). This prohibited clan is that
Gilyak tujma akhmalk k:khal, the clan of the second degree,
the prohibition of which is so incomprehensible. Now the
reason is clear: the tujma akhmalk clans are prohibited be-
cause they primordially entered into one common exogamous
division.

That this prohibited clan fully corresponds to the Gilyak
may be easily ascertained from our table.

The first clan gives women to the third, and consequently
it is its akhmalk of the first degree, but the third clan, in
turn, gives women to the second, i. e., to the latter as well
it is an akhmalk of the first degree. Thus, the first clan is
tujma akhmalk of the second clan, i. e., of the clan which
is in the same exogamous division with it.

Thus, I hope that we have succeeded in proving the
close genetic tie between the Gilyak system and the
Australian one from which it separated at that stage when
the change toward the elimination of marriage between
bilateral cousins of the first degree began.

One system solved the question by means of a shift to
marriages between male cousins of the second degree and
the final prohibition of marriages between the children
of brother and sister in the first generation -- a prohibition
fixed in the institution of classes, as among the Arunta.
The other system prohibited exchange marriages, preserving
obligatory unilateral marriages between the offspring of
brother and sister, and fixed its norms in the institution of
the four-clan phratry.

A still third variant is possible. Let us once again
imagine the moment when it was decided to shift /235/
from the bilateral marriage of cousins of the first degree
to the unilateral one, when it will be impossible to exchange
women. Until that moment society was divided into two
halves in the following manner:

● 121
* 174
615
* 835

/235 cont. /

- I. $(A^1 + v^1) + (A^2 + v^2) + (A^3 + v^3) + (A^4 + v^4) + (A^5 + v^5) + (A^6 + v^6)$.
II. $(V^1 + a^1) + (V^2 + a^2) + (V^3 + a^3) + (V^4 + a^4) + (V^5 + a^5) + (V^6 + a^6)$.

Now it is necessary to shift to the unilateral marriage, for exchanging sisters is impossible, but now there are no unilateral cousins of the first degree, and only for the first time is it possible to observe the prohibition on the exchange of sisters; consequently, the son of A^1 may marry the daughter of V^1 , but the son of V^1 may not marry the daughter of A^1 ; he may marry the daughter of A^2 , his female cousin of the nearest degree, etc. Then the picture of marriage is the following:

I. $(A^1 + v^1) + (A^2 + v^2) + (A^3 + v^3) + (A^4 + v^4) + (A^5 + v^5) + (A^6 + v^6)$

1. $(V^1 + a^2) + (V^2 + a^1) + (V^3 + a^4) + (V^4 + a^3) + (V^5 + a^6) + (V^6 + a^5)$

I. 1) $(A^1 + v^1) + (A^3 + v^3) + (A^5 + v^5)$: 1st clan takes women from clan 3, that of the mother's brother.

2) $(A^2 + v^2) + (A^4 + v^4) + (A^6 + v^6)$: 2nd clan takes women from clan 4.

II. 3) $(V^1 + a^2) + (V^3 + a^4) + (V^5 + a^6)$: 3rd clan takes women from clan 2.

4) $(V^2 + a^1) + (V^4 + a^3) + (V^6 + a^5)$: 4th clan takes women from clan 1.

/383 cont./

683 and other objects. In the second case the adversaries fight it out
[411] with cudgels until one side admits defeat. The Gilyak are most
[868] proficient at wielding cudgels. The Gilyak study this art from
[859] childhood, and the children give themselves up with passion to
this noble exercise, even by moonlight on frosty winter nights.
628 In their civil relationships, as a general rule, the Gilyak display
648 veracity, fidelity to their word, and conscientiousness. /384/
177 Unfortunately, the destructive influence of the rascally popula-
tion of the Amur region has begun to extend even to the most
remote Gilyak settlements. A few individuals imbibe wisdom
at Nikolayevsk, and it is enough to enmesh whole settlements in
deceit and to breed imitators and a whole mass of interminable
lawsuits. The court and mediation of the clansmen, still exerting
authority within the clan, are becoming powerless when the
quarrel is between members of different clans. The Gilyak have
the custom of turning to a mixed assembly of "khlay-nivukhi"
of different clans for the resolution of mutual disputes. But at the
[178] present time this institution is losing its strength, since the Russified
Gilyak, who are simultaneously the chief culprits of dissension
and lawsuits, deny to it respect and competence. The Russian
administration is going to impart authority to this court of "wise"
and honorable men by sanctioning the "khlay-nivukhi" by election,
regulating the time of their meetings, the area of their authority,
etc. And a first condition is that the "khlay-nivukhi" be of vari-
ous clans. Observation has shown that the Gilyak are able to elect
men intelligently and to appreciate the importance of the elected
court sanctioned by the Russian administration.

V

Statistical Data

• 121
128

In conclusion, in order to provide some idea of the num-
ber of Sakhalin Gilyak and to present their economic status more

/384 cont. /

128 realistically, we consider it appropriate to cite some of the nu-
[121] merical data obtained by us on these questions during the detailed
1891 census. In doing so, it seems more convenient to deal sep-
arately with: (a) the western coast, between the Aleksandrovska
post and Cape Marii (the northernmost extremity of the western
coast); and (b) the eastern coast and the basin of the Tym' River
between Cape De La Kroyer and Cape Levenshtern (the northern
extremity of the eastern coast).

103 (a) The western coast. There are 25 Gilyak winter settle-
361 ments between the Aleksandrovska post and Cape Marii. They are
located in the following order: Arkyyvo, Yamy, Manginay,
Tangi, Khoe (Khoi), Viakhtu, Tyki, Vaaz, Nyde (1), Noksy,

[167] 1. Formerly the area of this settlement
was inhabited by the Tungus, whose
grave monuments, consisting of boxes
with crosses on top of them, are still pre-
served on the low sandy shore of the strait.

Tyrki, Tengi, Tal'votigrvo (2), Marnlvo, Nyanivo, Marvo,

[491] 2. There is a road from here to the
settlement of Lyangr on the mainland.

Vaskhonkhvo, Kitnidvo, /385/ Tamlyvo, Lirkryvo, Viskvo,
[114] Pomr (1), Pil'vo, Tumi, and Nyur. The village of Koybygrvo,

[491] 1. There is a road from here to the
village of Kekhrvo on the Okhotsk
coast (one or two days).

162 which is marked on the map north of Nyur, no longer exists. In
the settlements enumerated there are 78 yurts in which 245 family-
households live (2). The total population is 1,041, of whom

[592]
[128] 2. By the word "family" is understood
here first, any married couple, adult

G /8 cont./

123 absolutely negative. In their naïve way they, of course, did not suspect that I might have understood their conversation.

SS
121 The above-mentioned circumstances that I was unable to come into equally close contact with all the Amur peoples naturally was fundamentally decisive for the nature of the treatment of the subject in the following pages. If detailed or even approximately complete information about all the Amur peoples were available to us, a monographic discussion of them would perhaps be most suitable; for with such a comprehensive picture of the physical and spiritual life of each individual people, its entire individuality would be seen more precisely. But we do not have such rich material at our disposal. Moreover, with such a treatment a drawback, I mean frequent repetitions, would be unavoidable. For primitive peoples, or at the least peoples who are still half-wild, who live as neighbors under the same stretch of sky, are thrown upon the same nature, the same food resources and means of existence, and stand under the same, though equally slight cultural influences, always have many correspondences with one another in their way of life, their practices and customs, their views, etc., however much they differ with respect to descent and language. For these reasons I preferred not to take up the various peoples of the Amur region coming under consideration here singly, one after the other, but rather in a comparative fashion, beside one another, always starting with the Gilyak, who heretofore were known almost solely by name, whereas they are the very ones whom I know best. Although such a treatment does not give a full, well-rounded, and self-contained picture of any of the peoples concerned, but rather only fragmentary descriptions, from which the reader has to put together the total picture himself, nevertheless, it might also have an advantage over the monographic treatment, beyond the avoidance of repetition already stressed, in that it offers more opportunities for general comparisons and conclusions concerning separate phenomena in the life of primitive peoples and therefore also permits much deeper insight into the natural and cultural history of mankind.

SS
121
128

G
SS 78 cont./

● 121 Finally, by constantly keeping the entire region before our eyes,
128 it may also lead to a more complete ethnographic picture of it.

G
SS
126 The accompanying plates are also arranged in accordance
128 with this treatment of the subject. I still have a few words to say
about them beforehand. Since the Academy sent a draftsman
with me, my aim was to give as clear and detailed a picture as
possible of the life of the Amur peoples and everything connected
with it, their dwelling, clothing, their household, hunting and
fishing apparatus, their tombs, idols, and the like, by means of
drawings, too. Concerning certain things in particular, such as,
for example, the degree of skill shown by these peoples in making
their utensils, the taste expressed in the decoration of their im-
plements as well as their clothing, the possible influence on this
from foreign, Chinese, /9/ and Japanese patterns, no judgment
can be formed without the illustrations. A clear, concrete idea
of the total being and doings of a people, however, can certainly
be obtained only with a certain completeness of pictorial rep-
resentations. It therefore did not seem proper to me to be too
frugal with the number of these illustrations or to omit them
wherever in earlier travel accounts, on the occasion of discussing
other and especially Siberian peoples, similar, though at times
rather crude representations are found. For the same reason I
have only in rare cases taken note of the illustrations, neat as
they are, which are found in the rather inaccessible atlas of Mr.
Maack's /Maak/ trip in the Amur region, and all the more since
the work concerned (1) contains no ethnographic text, but only

G
SS
[129]

G
SS
[113]

1. Puteshestvie na Amur", soversh.
po rasporiazheniiu Sibirsk. Otdiela Imp.
Russk. Geogr. Obshch. v" 1855 g.
R. Maakom" /A Journey to the Amur,
completed by R. Maak under the
auspices of the Siberian Section of the
Imperial Russian Geographic Society
in 1855/, St. Petersburg, 1859.

S.S. /94 cont./

175
167
131
peoples could and must have frequently resulted during this time, but they are most difficult to perceive from the historical reports available, for, on the one hand, the territorial boundaries of roaming hunting and seminomadic fishing peoples are never very /95/ definite and even at the present time are inadequately known among the Amur peoples, and, on the other hand, the historical reports concerned, since we are indebted for them to the notes and reports of simple, uneducated people pursuing practical interests, suffer as a rule from too much vagueness and sometimes obscurity for our purposes, and, what is worse, they not infrequently present the Amur peoples under names that are completely foreign to us today and therefore require an interpretation beforehand. Now, whether the interpretations and explanations that will be found in the following pages are always the correct ones must remain undecided to begin with --for my part I hope, since they are not without reason, that they will be verified in most cases at least and may provide a key for a better understanding of some of the historical reports concerning the Amur region and the ethnographic facts contained in them.

G
175
121
113
Let us begin again with the peoples of the lower Amur region and from among them with the most extreme, the Gilyak. The first printed mention of the Gilyak is found on the map published by Nicolaus Witsen in 1687 in Amsterdam and dedicated to Peter the Great, "Nieuwe Land-Karte van het Noorder- en Ooster-Deel van Asia en Europa /New Map of the North-eastern Part of Asia and Europe/" (1), and in

S.S.
G

175
114
113

1. Müller (Sammlung Russ. Gesch., Vol. I, pp. 203 ff., and Vol. VI, pp. 29 ff.) gave a detailed description and evaluation of this map. In addition to the rare, original edition of this map, I have before me another copy of the Witsen map provided by Allard on a smaller scale and with some corrections, which was not mentioned either by Müller in his

/105 cont./

175
131
648 the late season obliged him to winter over. At what place among the Gilyak this first wintering of the Russians occurred cannot be ascertained with certainty -- perhaps on the left bank of the Amur at Cape Tschnyrrach, or Tschchykrach, as the Gilyak themselves call it, for there in the ground overgrown with dense forest and strikingly luxuriant underbrush I saw unevennesses which could very well have been the remains of former earth huts. In the summer of 1645, Pojarkof went from there to the sea and along the coast up to the Ulja /Ulya/ River, which he /106/ reached after twelve weeks and on which he again wintered, not to return to Yakutsk until the following year (1). No details, however, are known concerning this sea

[113]

1. Müller, Samml. Russ. Gesch., Vol. II, 1736, pp. 302, 303. The same, "Nachrichten von dem Amur-Flusse," in Büsching's Magazin für die neue Historie und Geogr., Part 2, second ed., Hamburg, 1769, p. 505. Cf. also Fischer, Sibir. Gesch., Vol. II, 1768, pp. 788, 789. For Pojarkof's original report, see Dopolneniia k" aktam" istoricheskim, sobr. i izdann. arkheograf. Kommissieiu /Supplements to the Historical Documents Collected and Published by the Archeographic Commission/, St. Petersburg, 1848, Vol. III, p. 55 (the pertinent place in the report).

• [121] voyage. I shall also give here the reports of Pojarkof's successors insofar as they pertain to the Gilyak and their immediate neighbors, in order to compare the statements and add a few remarks concerning them.

In 1651, Jerofei Chabarof /Khabarov/, going down the Amur by boat, entered its lower course. There were still Djutscheren living at a distance of a seven-days' journey from the Sungari, and then at a large village located on a mountain on the right bank the Atschanen (Achany) people began, in whose territory, several days' journey farther down, Chabarof

/516/

Section 8

000

Fishing, and in particular Sturgeon, Hausen, and Salmon. Fishing. Fishing Equipment. Marine-animal Fishing: Seal, White Whale.

226

[171]
[433]

In the preceding chapters it has been repeatedly stressed that fishing plays a more or less important role among all the peoples of the Amur region, and that in particular its importance increases all the more the farther one goes downstream, until finally, in the region of the mouth of the Amur River, it becomes among the Gilyak the conditio sine qua non for their entire existence. The intermeshing of the various conditions and aspects of life made it necessary for us in the above descriptions of the housing, clothing, and locomotion of the Amur peoples to make many references to fishing itself or to the consequences of it. For example, one must consider the influence that fishing exerts upon the lesser or greater sedentariness of the various peoples in the Amur region, in that, to be sure, in contrast to hunting, it gives them in general a more sedentary life, but even so requires a change of locality and dwelling twice a year, and commonly during the summer repeated moves along the water. Furthermore, the more or less predominant part that fishing has in the procurement of their food, clothing, and other necessities of life was discussed. In this connection the kinds of fish most important to the Amur peoples were named, and both the way they are eaten and the preparation of provisions out of them for the use of people and dogs were described in detail.

[361]
[221]

• [121]

And so, after all of that, there only remains for us to learn the way, how and by what means, fishing for at least the most important fish is carried on by the Amur peoples, as well as the times when it is done and some of the details connected with it.

/517/ As usual, we shall again start with the Gilyak, and, to be sure, with the Amur Gilyak, who are in every respect superior to their countrymen. To be sure, fishing in the Amur is also done in winter, but then it is relatively not very profitable and ceases completely toward spring when the ice becomes so

/631/

000

III. Ethnographic Part

Second Half: Basic Features of Family Life, Social Life, and the Inner Life

Section 11

Family relations: marriage, wife purchase, and wife capture. Morality. Domestic tasks and occupations of husband and wife. Childbirth, the feeding, treatment, and rearing of children. Position of the male and female slaves in the household. The family law of inheritance. Blood revenge.

•121

If in the discussion of the basic conditions and elements of the external life of the Amur peoples I deemed it necessary to dwell more or less exhaustively only on the peoples of the lower Amur region, but, with regard to those on the upper course of the river, to point out only in a general way the particularly typical and characteristic differences in contrast to them, this will be the case to an even greater extent in the following considerations turning more and more to the inner life. In fact, I must here limit myself almost exclusively to the Gilyak and to the Olcha, who, except in language and some ideas and customs which are in part perhaps rooted in tribal peculiarities, have been permeated by the Gilyak spirit and almost completely Gilyakized, and even the adjacent tribes on the lower Amur will only be touched upon for comparison, for it was only with the former that I had intercourse long enough to obtain some, albeit superficial, insight into the problems to be discussed here. Hence the discussion of the Amur peoples, which up to now has been kept comparative as much as possible, will in this last part take on more of the character of a monograph and will center almost exclusively on the people that has been the focus and point of departure for all of our previous discussions.

595

The Gilyak are not bound by custom or religion to any definite form of marriage. Actually, however, by far the majority of them live in monogamy. In fact, it prevails /632/ among them to such an extent that one may designate it as the general rule, but polygamy, on the other hand, occurring only under

/633 cont. /

583 It is to be seen in part from the preceding that the custom
 • 121 of wife purchase has, on the whole, a beneficial influence upon a
 182 primitive people. Even though, to our minds, it involves an in-
 [562] sulting disregard for human dignity and the personal rights of the
 woman, /634/ in that, in relation to the man, it makes her simply
 a commodity, nevertheless it exerts some moral pressure upon the
 men. For, above all, it forces them, through activity and indus-
 try, to acquire the means to buy a wife and to found a household
 of their own, and thus it puts an effective curb on premature
 marriages. Moreover, as we have seen, through the material
 obstacles that it puts in the way of polygamy, it promotes
 monogamy. And, finally, it provides the wife with both a
 guarantee of good treatment on the part of her parents, for a
 well-fed and well-supported girl can be married off more easily
 and at a higher price, and, in particular, some protection against
 rough mistreatment on the part of the husband, for what is bought
 with difficulty and at some expense is as a rule, among primitive
 people in particular, more highly prized and better cared for than
 that which is attained without effort and for a low price or even
 [562] as a gift. Thus, among primitive peoples, the bride price to
 a certain extent constitutes a corrective for their lack of esteem
 and spiritual appreciation of the wife, and the higher it is, the
 greater its effect is bound to be, and the more favorable the
 prognosis for the marital and family relations of the people con-
 cerned. To what extent this may be true among the Gilyak,
 beyond the above-mentioned prevalence of monogamy among
 them, we shall have occasion to learn from the following ob-
 servations.

583 On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the higher
 the bride price, the greater the temptation for poor but enterprising
 young men to avoid paying it and to gain possession of a wife by
 a ruse or force. Indeed, among the Gilyak the abduction of
 women is by no means rare. According to their own statements,
 it almost always takes place by prearrangement between the two
 parties, the abductor and the one to be abducted. In order to
 carry it out, the man appears, as if by chance, in the house

121 In 1931 I was sent to the Amur Gilyaks for the purpose of studying their dialect and of collecting materials for an ABC book. I was able to devote some of my time to the study of problems in the field of ethnography, such as: the history of the Gilyak clans, land property of the clans, interclan relations, the fishing industry, etc. In the following survey I put before the reader the material gathered in the course of this work and pertaining to the fishing industry of the Gilyaks in the village of Kul.

225 At the first signs of spring, beginning with the month of
782 gar-lo (crow month') (1), the Gilyaks of Kul go seal-hunting.

1. Corresponds approximately to the end of February--beginning of March.

They get out hooks and replace the old strings on them with new ones. Then they perform a religious-magical ceremony which consists in exposing the hooks to the smoke of spruce and of a plant locally known as (t₂kr) bogulnik and set out on sleighs pulled by dogs to the tremendous ice fields of the sea of Okhotsk. On arrival, the Gilyak hunter lets a kuti-ŋan-gan
225 (a dog seeking holes') search for seal air-holes. The Gilyak
411 lowers his hooks into each of the holes found by the dog. The hooks are fastened to a stick put across the air-hole. When the seal wants to breathe, it sticks out its head. The hooks in the air-hole hinder the seal, and when the seal wants to submerge, one or two hooks are thrust into its body. The hooks of the tackle kite (2) which go into the implements for hunting

2. Tackle for seal-hunting in the summer. The main part of this tackle is a large number of sharp hooks.

seals in air-holes are so sharp that they pierce the body at the slightest resistance. On the following day the Gilyak returns to the same place. He looks to see if a seal caught
225 on his hooks. The Gilyak first pulls the captured seal through
411 the air-hole and then kills it by hitting it over the head with a
531 striker specially made for the killing of seals. This striker called toŋr-tas (from toŋr 'head', za-d 'hit', a suffix pertaining to the implement used in the action), is made of a bough of some strong tree. The bough is cut off together with a piece of stem at its base which is then rounded. At the lower end of the handle of this peculiar hammer is a carving which represents the snout of a seal.

PREFACE

"Many books on Siberia have appeared during the last two decades, most of which fall into one of two categories; the earlier, into what we may label 'exile literature,' and the later, 'Siberian railway sketches.'

The present work belongs in part to both of these classes, but deals chiefly with a portion of Siberia far beyond the terminus of the Trans-Siberian Railway—the little-known island of Sakhalin. Such a terra incognita has Sakhalin been in the history of exploration, that until the year 1849 it was believed to be a peninsula even by the Russians; and six years later, in 1855, an English naval commander was outwitted owing to the prevailing ignorance of its insularity. (1)

1. See post, p. 100.

It is therefore not surprising that, even as late as this twentieth century, I should have been the first English traveller to explore the northern interior."

"The sources of our knowledge of Sakhalin, even in Russian, are few, and in English, if little has been heard of the convicts there, nothing has been written about the Gilyak and Orochon natives. With the expansion of the penal settlements, and the future, though not impending, development of the resources of the island, must follow the decay of the [viii] native in the presence of the white man. Already the former is modifying or abandoning his religious rites and ceremonies. It therefore behoved me to place these on record before they became lost to the investigator or buried in tradition.

If in the course of the narrative faunal and floral species have been noted, this is only what every traveller owes to the scientist and the ever-increasing body of students. At the same time no one regrets more than I do, that I was so inadequately equipped for my task among almost unknown peoples and amid strange physical conditions. "

"In Chapter VI. will be found a brief résumé of the [ix] history and general features of Sakhalin. The rest of the book, including the notes on Korea and Manchuria, consists mainly of a personal narrative. It makes no claim to an exhaustive account of Sakhalin or the neighbouring regions, for the author's object has been to place before the reader pictures. Incidents, trivial in themselves, illustrate and bring home to the mind the everyday life of native and white man in this far eastern world, more effectively than any detailed statement of habits and customs. "

- 115 [97] Since little has been published about the Gilyak. up to the
● 121 present time, I took advantage of my visit of several years
duration in the Amur country to study this small tribe some-
what more in detail. All races are of interest, not only in
themselves, but because they furnish material for advanced
scholarship. If the professional ethnologist should find
something in this sketch which can be used for the purpose
of such comparative study, it would give me great pleasure.

The material I present here is based largely on my own
experiences and investigations, but in part it is based on
notes which I gathered from those Russians who had fre-
quently come in contact with the Gilyak. I was always
careful to question several people about each subject, for the
sake of greater accuracy. The statements, moreover, usu-
ally coincided. (1)

1. For my reports about the Gilyak on the
island of Sakhalin, with whom I had little
personal contact, I am largely indebted to a
physician who lived there: Dr. A. Lebedev.

- 101 I. Geographical Distribution and Population.
131 The tribe of Gilyaks (2) which belongs to the Mongolian
182

2. The word is usually written "Giliak"
but because the "g" is hard in pronunciation,
I added the "h". [RCH: The author throughout
spells the word Ghiliakin.]

race lives partly on the island of Sakhalin, partly on the con-
tinent, in the coastal region of East Siberia, that is, on the
lower Amur and on the sea coast around the mouth of this
river, as well as on the De Kastro bay and the Kaiser bay.
On the latter, the Gilyak are found only sparsely and more
temporarily. On the island of Sakhalin they occupy the north-
ern half, especially the Tym river valley, and the east and west
coasts. In the summer they occupy one or another place,
according to where fishing [98] is best; but in winter they
always go back to their villages.

On the lower Amur the true Gilyak are to be found only
as far as the village of Bogorodskoye, 150 versts up-stream
from the city of Nikolayevsk. From Bogorodskoye up to the
Amur tributary of Gorin, that is, from about 51 degrees
north latitude, there lives a people that may be considered
a cross between the Gilyak and the Goldi. They call

[378] Captain Jakobsen's Travels in the Region of the Gilyak and on Sakhalin Island.

Otto Genest (Gymnasium Teacher)

121

Jakobsen's first sojourn in the land of the Goldi (compare number 10 of the current volume of the periodical, p. 153 [see Goldi Source 18; Genest--Analyst] was followed by a trip into the territory of the Gilyak through which he had to pass in order to reach Nikolayevsk. He touched the same territory for a second time when on his return from Sakhalin Island, he started his journey up the Amur River towards the Ussuri and North Korea at the end of January 1885. Both times he had only a little time at his disposal; in September of 1884 he had to rush to get to Nikolayevsk as soon as possible in order to take advantage of an opportunity to cross over to Sakhalin; January 1885 he was pressing with all his power to conclude his activities since by force of circumstances he had lost so much time on Sakhalin that he was afraid of having to extend his travels too much if he should stop for a detailed study of the Gilyak. It is therefore understandable that his collections made in the territory of the Gilyak are far inferior to those made in the land of the Goldi as regards copiousness and variety. Also the information he was able to gather from his own observation or through his inquiries understandably gives only a hazy picture of the life and activities of this people. Unfortunately he only had little opportunity to become acquainted with the representatives of the Gilyak people living on Sakhalin Island and thus to fill the gaps of his account of this people. Nevertheless the entries in his diary present several things of interest, but especially valuable is the fact that he was permitted to observe a bear festival in the Gilyak village Vaida above Nikolayevsk, the procedure of which he has described in great detail.

101

142

The Gilyak have been designated as Hyperboreans or Arctics by Rittich (1), as Northern Asiatics of uncertain

1. Die Ethnographie Russlands,
supplementary issue 54 to
Petermann's Mittheilungen, p. 19.

position within the system by Peschel (2). They are

2. Peschel-Kirchoff, Völkerekunde (5th